DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 798 FL 017 552

AUTHOR Di Pietro, Robert J.
TITLE Interactive Discourse in the L2 Classroom.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (8th, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, August 16-21, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Techniques; Creative Teaching; Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); Instructional Effectiveness; *Interaction Process Analysis; Language Proficiency; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS *Scenarios; *Self Regulation; University of Delaware

ABSTRACT

A study of the use of interactive discourse in the second language classroom begins with a discussion of the regulation of discourse, examines the use of scenarios for the promotion of interactive discourse, and provides evidence from classroom use of the effectiveness of this technique. Three types of discourse control are noted: object regulation, other-regulation, and self-regulation. It is proposed that scenarios allow students to exercise self-regulation in the target language while acquiring the necessary knowledge of target language rules and conversational management skills. The scenario, consisting of two or more roles, allows students to choose their own goals and strategies without the constraints of pre-specified attitudes or goals. The study was conducted with a class of 35 adult learners of English with different language backgrounds. Three scenario texts were examined: the transcription of the first performance of a two-role scenario, the edited version of the script, and a transcription of the performance that occurred after the students had seen the edited script. It is concluded that the scenario has the potential for stimulating language learning, and that the scenario should be carried through all three phases of rehearsal, performance, and debriefing. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299798

(paper presented at AILA conference,
Univ. of Sydney, Australia, Aug. 1987)

Interactive Discourse in the L2 Classroom

Robert J. Di Pietro

One of the trends observable at present in the field of L2 instruction is toward the promotion of discourse skills among learners. This trend is associated with another, longer standing trend toward the development of 'communicative competence' as a preferred goal of language instruction. Communication must certainly involve interaction, either between the teacher and the students or among the students without the overt intervention of the teacher. Interactive discourse can be generated from such commonly understood classroom activities as information-gap games and staged sociodramas. Demands placed on the students may range from filling in lacunae in blocks of information to solving problems based on data of various sorts supplied to them (see Pica 1986ms.). Simulations, as a rather intricate kind of communication activity, can involve the entire class in performing roles with prescribed agendas to be articulated (Jones, 1982).

All of the above-mentioned classroom activities appear to derive from a common opinion about the purpose of human language, namely that people speak to each other primarily to exchange, negotiate, or clarify meanings. This opinion is also evident in the widely held conception of communication strategies as particular ways of making one's self understood while understanding others (see, for example, Canale and Swain 1979 and Tarone 1981). On the other hand, there is reason to question such a view of communication strategy. Lantolf and Frawley (1985), for example, reject the so-called 'conduit' metaphor of communication whereby ideas are 'sent across' from speaker to hearer. Their preference is to interpret communication from a Vygotskyan perspective in which communication strategies are seen as efforts made by speakers to achieve self-regulation in the 'presence of other speakers' (see Lantolf and Frawley 1985, p. 150). The notion of 'regulatory agencies' has the potential for explaining much behavior evident in the performances of L2 learners. According to Vygotsky, there are three kinds of regulation: object, other and self (see Vygotsky 1978). A speaker who is overly object regulated is one whose discourse is strongly conditioned by a struggle with the rules and conventions of the language. Other regulation

FL017552

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Di Pietro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

is of two types: regulated and regulating. To be excessively other-regulated is to have one's verbal performance dictated by another person. Other-regulating activity is the same phenomenon seen from the other individual's point of departure. Finally, self regulation occurs when the speaker feels unconstrained in expressing personal thoughts, positions or feelings. It is not difficult to find examples of discourse in the FL classroom that typifies all three kinds of regulation. Object-regulation is manifested in the discourse of those students who are forced to adhere to exercises and grammatical drills. Other-regulation occurs between the teacher and the students, with the former usually regulating the latter through contrived questions of various sorts. The student who is asked to speak freely on any subject has been given the invitation to exercise self regulation. It is well to point out that all authentic discourse whether in the classroom or outside of it has elements of all three types of regulation. The speaker who does not heed elements of the grammar or 'artifact' of the language is not likely to be coherent. Certainly, participatory discourse requires a degree of other regulation. Discourse without a modicum of self regulation is usually nothing more than an exchange of ritualized protocols such as greetings and leave-takings.

If regulation is necessarily part of all interactive discourse then what special effects, if any, does it have on discourse in a second language, how should it be treated pedagogically and how should its results be interpreted? To find the answers to these three questions, a study was conducted of the discourse generated in the execution of scenarios in the classroom. The scenario is an activity that places learners in a situation in which they are free to choose among diverse goals and develop their own agendas for interaction as they work toward these goals (see Di Pietro 1987, p. 41). The intention is to allow students to exercise self regulation in the target language while acquiring the necessary knowledge of target language rules and target language conversational management skills. The scenario appears to be ideally suited for the promotion of interactive discourse in L2. Unlike role-plays or simulations, the students are not

constrained to assume a pre-specified attitude or goal. They chose their own goals and prepare their own plans for how to arrive at their goals.

The scenario typically consists of two roles, sometimes more. Each role contains the description of a situation in which the role player finds him/herself. For example:

> Role A: You have been hospitalized after a rather serious heart attack. So far, no one has given you any indication as to your chances for recovery. Your doctor is about to visit you. Work out a plan to get this information from him.

A certain amount of tension is built into the role in order to make it more than a reason to solicit information from the other party. The player of Role A must wonder why no information has been forthcoming about the consequences of the heart attack. Patients who are seriously ill are sometimes kept in the dark about their chances for recovery. The tension is increased by investing the counter-role--that of the doctor--with another, situationally related task:

> Role B: You are a doctor. Your patient has had a rather serious heart attack and is in the hospital. He/she does not know it yet but he/she has just won the national lottery. You must pass this news on to your patient. How will you do it without causing so much excitement that he/she will have another heart attack?

Classroom performances of this scenario have revealed that the tension can build between the two role players as the patient tends to interpret anything the doctor might say about 'taking it easy' or 'going on a long vacation' as indications that his/her life on earth will be short. More significantly, the interplay of the two roles fosters self-regulation as both players attempt to fulfill their agendas. They also engage in other regulation, being both regulating and regulated. Object regulation is mitigated by the fact that each role player goes through a rehearsal

phase during which other students share in the preparation of the agenda for the role. During rehearsal, students may ask any kind of questions they wish about the grammar, the appropriate vocabulary, pronunciation, verbal strategies, and any other matter pertaining to the agenda being prepared. These questions may be directed to other members of the group or to the teacher. In this way, the collective knowledge of the group is brought to bear on the learning task at hand. It is to be presumed that the extent to which learners are regulated by the object (in the form of target-language grammar, vocabulary, and conversational mechanisms) depends upon the level of proficiency attained in target language discourse. The higher the level of proficiency, the more native-like the discourse becomes in its reflection of the regulatory agencies during the performance phase. Only the discourse of the students in performance has been assessed in this study. Discourse generated during rehearsal, as well as during the debriefing phase that normally follows performance in the SI approach, is primarily pedagogical in nature and may be significantly different from what learners are likely to say in environments outside the instructional frame. The interplay of regulatory agencies in the rehearsal and debriefing phases will become the subject of future studies. For the time being, however, it is not unreasonable to assume that other regulation would predominate in both rehearsal and debriefing but it is not clear at this point how the central role of the teacher during debriefing affects the dynamics of interaction. It is clear as the result of the current study that performance discourse can serve as a stimulator for learning about the target language and gaining confidence in using it.

Goals of the study. The study had two related goals: (1) to determine the extent to which the performance of a scenario in the target language promoted self regulation and (2) how the opportunity to self regulate contributed to increased proficiency in the target language.

Description of the study. The study was conducted with a class of first-year students enrolled in the English Language Institute of the University of Delaware during the second and third week of January, 1986. The class of thirty-five students coming from countries in Europe,

Asia, and Latin America were broken down into rehearsal groups of five to six students.[1] As in standard SI procedure, each group was not allowed to know more about the coming interaction than what was written on their role card. Two scenarios were prepared, with A and B roles distributed to six rehearsal groups. After a period of approximately twenty-five minutes, single representatives from each group were chosen to perform the role assigned to that group. The non-performing students in each group were told that they should provide advice and help to their representative at any time he or she needed it during the performance. Due to limitations of time, only two performances took place, one each for the two scenarios assigned to the class. While both performances were videotaped, only the second one (of the scenario entitled 'Journey to the Past') is the subject of the current analysis.[2] This choice was made purely out of technical considerations. The students involved in the other scenario spoke very softly with the result that their voices were not clearly picked up by the recording equipment.

The roles of 'Journey to the Past' were stated as follows:

Role A: You work as a traveling salesperson and you are riding on a train. The person sitting next to you is very well-dressed. Since you sell clothing, this person may be interested in buying something from you. What will you say to him?

Role B: You are traveling on a train and are sitting next to someone who looks familiar to you. You realize that this person is the one who once sold you an expensive TV set that stopped working after one week. It cost you much money to have it fixed and you did not have the chance to tell this person about your problem because she was no longer at the store when you returned. What will you say now?

The roles could have been performed by either males or females. As it turned out, a female played role A and a male, role B.

A transcription was made of the dialog that took place between the two role players. In making the transcription, special care was taken to

indicate all features of discourse that may have some bearing on the interpretation of the interaction and the functioning of the regulatory agencies. An edited version of the dialog was then prepared from the transcription and given to the students at a class meeting held one week later. In making this edited version, the only changes were to correct grammatical errors, replace inappropriate or incorrect vocabulary where needed, and smooth out the style wherever it was overly clumsy. Excluded from the edited dialog were all phenomena that related to conversational management such as overlaps, hesitations, and self/other repairs. No changes were made to the sense or intent of what was said by the performers.

The two original performers of roles A and B were given an opportunity to look over the edited script at the outset of the second class meeting. They were told that the purpose of this script was to refresh their memories about what they had said in their first performance of the scenario. After approximately ten minutes, the script was taken away and the two were asked to re-perform their scenario. This second performance was videotaped and transcribed with the same care to record all features of discourse that have have relevance to the analysis. The two performances were then compared and conclusions were drawn about the function of the regulatory agencies and the manifest signs of changes in the students' target language discourse skills from the first meeting to the second.

The texts. Briefly put, three texts form the core of this study: a transcription of an initial performance of the scenario, an edited script of that performance which was shown to the students, and a transcription of the performance that occurred after the students had had a chance to review what they said initially. The key to the symbols used in the transcriptions, plus the three texts are as follows:

KEY:

=====	overloud speech
. . .	hesitation; each dot represents about .5 seconds of silence
uh, uhhh	hesitation filler delivered with mid central vowel; additional h's indicate lengthened vowel
hmmm	bilabial nasal hesitation filler
↑	syllable following symbol is delivered on overhigh pitch
( )	compressed speech, with overfast delivery
[ ]	segments of speech delivered simultaneously by both speakers
Z	rapid onset of speech by second party

FIRST PERFORMANCE:

A: ↑Where're you going?

B: Oh, I going to New York City (How about you?)

A: First, good, I have to pass in . in the New New York because I . I just returned to the country. You're ↑pretty today! Where you buy your clothes?

B: Let me . let me . oh! . I remember that uhhh me meet . . in another time.

A: Oh, I don't think .

B: Oh yes! You sold me a (TV) a television set in a . . once . . time.

A: No . . . I don't [think so
B: (you)] you remember in the last year . . . more or less in July . . . I went to the . . . uhh . . Radio Shack store . . . you work-ed there?

A: Minute, please, just a minute.

A goes to her group for consultation.

A: Sir, I think you're wrong because I . I . my job is [
B: I am sure]

A: No, no

B: [because
A: You you] make a mistake you make a mistake because I, I'm traveling sales . sales . [only sport
Teacher: clothing]

A: Huh?

Teacher: clothing.

A: only sales clothing . . OK? I I think you're you're . . y you're you're you're [
B: I am sure because uh . uh . for your bad sold . I lost . so much . . money.

A: No, no . . You're crazy . you are crazy . . you are very crazy.

B: Tell me . I . I tell about . . . I I told you about . my uh problem. When I bought the TV . . uh . . I lost . so much money because . the uh apparate . . . apparatus . . uh uh

B: was very [very] . . uh . . bad.
A: [ohh] It's terrible.

But I I sell only clothes. [I don't understand]
B: [When I I send you . .]

A: ↑anything on TV, radios, I don't understand anything [I I . . .
B:

A: I sell↑ only beautiful clothes. OK?

B: I am sure . . youuuu . . [
A: [No.

B: You send . . uh uh . . you sold me this apparatus.

A: No, no. I I don't sell . . . I↑ never sold (any) TVs and radios. I don't understand↑ anything about . . . [Really?
B:

A: Really. I am special. I understand only the special . . . OK? I know, I know what's what's the man dress now, OK? What the women uh can dress [now] but TV, radio, I don't know.
B: [ohh]

B: Maybe you are a twins?

(laughter from class)

B: You have a sis(ter) . . .

Teacher: You have a sister? You have a sister? What do you say to him. Tell him tell him [
A: [OK OK! uhhh I I my, my my I have a store, a big store, and mmm uhhh I (sell) only beautiful clothes for men . . . you understand?

B: But uh my question for you . . . (there) is a sister, someone similar to you?

A: I don't think so . . . I am I am different for the other parents. I am Brazilian.

B: Are you sure?

A: Yeah . . .

EDITED SCRIPT:

A: Where are you going?

B: To New York City. How about you?

A: I'm going to New York first. I need to stop off there because I've just returned to this country. You look handsome today! Where do you buy your clothes?

B: I seem to remember that we've met before.

A: I don't think so.

B: Oh, yes. You sold me a television set once.

A: No, I don't think so.

B: Do you remember last year, around July, I came to the Radio Shack store where you worked?

A: I think you're wrong because my job is selling clothes.

B: I am sure.

A: No, no. You're making a mistake because I'm a traveling salesperson. I only sell sport clothing.

B: I am sure because I lost a lot of money on account of you.

A: No, no. You're very mistaken.

B: Let me tell you about my problem. I lost a lot of money when I bought the TV because it was very defective.

A: Oh, that's terrible, but I sell only clothes. I don't know anything about TVs or radios.

B: But you sold me the TV.

A: I sell only beautiful clothes. I know what men are wearing now. I know what women are wearing. But I don't know anything about TVs and radios.

B: Maybe you are a twin? Do you have a sister somewhere who looks just like you?

A: No, I look quite different from my relatives. I'm from Brazil.

B: Are you certain?

A: Yes. There is no one like me in New York or anywhere else. Only in Brazil.

SECOND PERFORMANCE:

A: Good morning. How are you?

B: Fine, fine.

A: I'm fine! Where're you going?

B: To New York City, uhh hmmm how about you?

A: Ohhh at first I'm going to New York because I . . just . . I've just uhh (re)turned to this country uhhh but you're very handsome todayyyy . . where're you buying your clothes?

B: Ohhh let me . . hmmm I seemed to remember uhhh we've meet before.

A: Nooo . I don't think so.

B: I am sure.

A: No, I don't think so.

B: Do you remember . . last year . around July . I . came to (the) Radio Shack where you work-ed?

A: I think you making . made a mistake because I oonl . . I sell only clothes. I am a traveling uhhh traveling person woman.

B: I am sure because I . . lost a lot of money account of you.

A: No, I don't accept anything about TVs or radios I am only a sale . . some clothes . sport clothes.

B: Let me tell you uhh when I uh bought the (TV) I losss uhhh lot of money because the TV was uhhh defective.

A: It's terrible I know but . I'm never sell . . TVs or I only sells clothes. Look at (your) shoes . I think you need to change your shoes.

B: These [shoes are / (These are nice shoes)] the last year's styles .

A: the winter style.

B: uh but uh right now, I (don't need) any . . clothes .

A: ahhh but if . you , see . my . clothes . . it's wonnnnderful. I think you're . you need . to buy some thing.

B: But I suppose uhhh your. . . store is (very ex)pense.

A: No, don't worry about the price. Its very very cheap. It [have a lot] of kind of fashions.

B: [uhhhh] That's too bad because . . right now I only need a . a . recuper . recup . (my) money.

The analysis of the data. It is immediately apparent from a review of the first performance that each role player is intent on fulfilling their individual goals. Player A makes the first overt move in her role as clothing salesperson by complimenting player B ('You're pretty today') and then asking him to tell her where he buys his clothes. Rather than answer her, player B initiates his own agenda as 'injured buyer' by suggesting that they already know each other from an earlier encounter ('I remember that uhhh we meet . . in another time'). Player A refuses to admit to having met player B and when player B insists by stating a specific date and place, she calls for time out in order to consult with her rehearsal group. When she returns to the interaction, she tells B that he is mistaken. The interaction becomes more heated after player B informs A that she was responsible for having sold him an inferior TV. She tells B that he is 'crazy', a remarkably abrupt change from the politeness she displayed toward him just a few minutes earlier. Player B's counter move is to recount the details of the transaction that presumably occurred between them. A's defense is to insist that she knows nothing about TVs or radios and that she is in the clothing business. B changes his strategy to suggest that she may have a twin sister. A does not pick up this opening which would have allowed her a way out. Instead, she firmly states that she is quite distinctive in her family.

It is to be kept in mind that all of the content of the interaction was made up by the two interlocutors themselves. The only two attempts at other regulation by the teacher occurred when he supplied the appropriate lexical item 'clothing' when player A was struggling to identify her assumed occupation and when he attempted to make her respond to B's suggestion that she had a sister. Neither attempt was successful, as A persisted in pursuing her own strategies in both instances. There

is ample evidence from the discourse that each player attempts to regulate the other but neither is especially successful. The interaction ends with neither having given ground to the other. It is also clear that both players are having difficulty with the elements that make up the object regulating agency, namely the pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary of English. Some examples can be found in the problems both A and B have with verb tense and in B's overslow and hesitant delivery at various points. Yet, it is not possible to conclude that object-regulation was a factor in shaping the discourse because there are no points at which concern for accuracy in pronunciation, grammar or vocabulary hindered the players from attempting to attain their personal goals. The interplay of strategies evident in the discourse lead to the conclusion that the overriding regulating agency was the self. B is clearly on the offensive in trying to get A to admit to engaging in an earlier transaction but A does not acquiesce. Instead, A counterattacks by telling B that he is wrong and/or crazy and extolling her own competence as a specialist in clothing. In general, the interaction has a distribution of object-, other-, and self-regulation which would be characteristic of an authentic discourse involving two individuals in a similar altercation in real-life. What is special about this particular discourse is that it took place between two learners of English functioning in a formal classroom setting. The two players are obviously not fluent in their command of English, even though they found ways to defend their positions in the interaction. The question to be answered next is: what progress toward fluency, as well as accuracy, in the target language can be gained in this kind of pedagogical activity?

To answer that question, an investigation of the second performance is necessary. As pointed out above, the two role-players were given the chance to look over a corrected transcript of their conversation before performing it a second time. There is indication that the two role players were influenced by this review. The first three-quarters of their second performance is considerably more accurate in grammar and vocabulary than their first one. For example, A remembers to call A 'handsome' rather than 'pretty,' and B replaces his fragmentary sentence, 'I went to the

Radio Shack / you worked there?' with one connected by a relative pronoun, 'I came to the Radio Shack where you worked.' An example of B's increase in fluency can be found by comparing his statements about how he lost money from the first and second performances: '...for your bad sold, I lost so much money' (first performance) and '...I lost a lot of money account of you'.

The two performances differ in yet another, critical way. There are no overlaps in the major part of the second one. In the first performance, the overlaps--as well as the rapid onsets of speech--reflected the authentically polemical nature of the discourse. In contrast, the second performance appears to be almost a 'textbook-perfect' dialog being played out by students who have dutifully learned their roles. There is no need for overlap or rapid onsets because each player knows what is coming. In Vygotskyan terms, they are attending to the object and being regulated by it. However, at a point late in the interaction, player A decides to try a new strategy--one that she did not use in the first interaction. She draws attention to B's shoes, calling them 'last year's styles' and suggesting that he purchase new ones. At this point, B overlaps with a hasty defense ('these are nice shoes') and the interaction becomes a new one, with the participants departing from what they said originally in the first performance and disregarding the corrected script that was prepared for them. B tells A that he does not need any new clothes, to which A retorts that her line of clothing is 'wonnnnderful.' B then supposes that her store is expensive, but A dispells his concern about prices, claiming that the store is 'very, very cheap.' B ends the interaction by expressing his regret about not recuperating his money.

What inspired A to make her departure from the first performance and the script based on that performance? There are several possible answers to this question: the corrected script gave her the confidence in her grammatical ability needed to try a new approach or the desire to regain self-regulation was sufficiently compelling to lead her to abandon the safety of the predictable script. Perhaps both answers are the right ones. In any event, if we are to look for improvements in grammatical accuracy and fluency in the target language, it is necessary to examine <u>not</u> what

was said in the first part of the second performance but in the part that begins with A's remark about B's shoes. It is in that portion of the discourse that the two players reassume their full roles as interlocutors in the scenario that formed the first performance. They resort to the same conversational style, with overlaps, hesitations and compressed speech. They also make some grammatical errors. Nevertheless, they produce some utterances that are very native, not only in form but in delivery as well. B's quick defense ('These are nice shoes') and A's reassurance about the cost of items in her store ('Don't worry about the price, it's very, very cheap') are indications that both students have made progress in their use of English in a realistic context.

The absence of native-like accuracy in the first performance of the scenario conforms to a finding by Lantolf and Khanji (1983) who noted an increase in parataxis in the discourse of an ESL student as he moved from performing in a structured interview to speaking freely on a topic of his own choice. Lantolf and Khanji also found, however, that syntactic accuracy decreased as the paratactic fluency of their subject become more dominant. The combination of accuracy and fluency in the speech of players A and B in the latter portion of the second performance of the present study suggests that a development toward greater control of the target language had occurred since the first encounter with the scenario a week earlier.

If this greater control is a manifestation of increasing proficiency in the target language, to what is it owed? The author would prefer to attribute it fully to the activity of the scenario, including the planning allowed by the rehearsal phase and the model of well-formed speech provided by the corrected script. However, since the students were studying the language in a country where it is also the language of the surrounding community, the potential effect of factors outside the classroom cannot be dismissed. It seems reasonable, at the very least, to conclude that the scenario, with its built-in interactional tension, served to focus the attention of the learners on tasks

to be carried out in earnest: A was directed to sell clothing to B and B was charged with determining the culpability of A in an unfortunate past transaction. The suggestion being made here is that such a focus would lead the learner to process input from what is heard in the surrounding speech community and apply it meaningfully to gaining control over strategic discourse functions and critical vocabulary and grammar. In simpler words, the scenario has the potential to serve as a stimulator of second-language acquisition. A part of its success in doing so must derive from the encouragement it gives students to engage in self-regulation through interactive discourse on problematic issues.

With regard to application in the classroom, the scenario should be taken through its three phases of rehearsal, performance and debriefing (see Di Pietro 1987, for details). While the subjects in the present study were not put through a formal debriefing, they were allowed to review the corrected script of their own performances. This review served the function of a debriefing. Finally, promoting truly interactive discourse in the second-language classroom places new demands on the teacher and methodologist. Effective scenarios must be prepared and students must be free to find their own solutions to them. Issues must be chosen that are challenging and roles must be drawn up in a manner that does not force the players to work toward pre-determined ends. Above all, the teacher should not insist that a certain conclusion is to be preferred.

The scenario technique can easily serve as a bridge between elementary levels of instruction and more advanced ones.

Some scenarios can function satisfactorily at any level of instruction. In anticipation of further research on the subject of interactive discourse in the context of second-language instruction, scenarios provide a unique framework for experimentation because they extend the paradigm beyond elements of language artifact to how learners utilize language in the service of their own egos.

Footnotes

[1]The author wishes to thank Mr. Scott Stevens, Director of the English Language Institute of the University of Delaware and Ms. Sandra McCollum, ESL instructor at the University, for providing the opportunity to conduct this study in Ms. McCollum's class.

[2]The scenario 'Journey to the Past' is the invention of Ms. Julie Docker, instructor of Italian at the Australian National University in Canberra.

References

Canale, M. and Swain, M. 1980. 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.' Applied Linguistics, 1, p. 1-47.

Di Pietro, R. 1987. Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Jones, K. 1982. Simulations in language teaching. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Lantolf, J. and Frawley, W. 1985. 'On communication strategies: A functional perspective,' Rassegna italiana di linguistica applicata, n. 2-3, p. 143-157.

Lantolf, J. and Khanji, R. 1983. 'Non-linguistic parameters of interlanguage performance and Vygotskyan psycholinguistics: implications for L2 instruction,' The 10th. LACUS Forum, Hornbeam Press, Columbia, S.C., p. 425-440.

Pica, T. 1986ms. 'Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York, December, 1986.

Tarone, E. 1981. 'Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy,' TESOL Quarterly, 15, p. 285-295.

Vygotsky, L. 1978. Mind in society. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.